



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/000,454	12/04/2001	Achim Breuer	32368-174691 9210		
7:	590 11/14/2005	EXAMINER			
VENABLE Post Office Box 34385 Washington, DC 20043-9998			SENFI, BEHROOZ M		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2613		
			DATE MAILED: 11/14/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/000,454	BREUER ET AL.	BREUER ET AL.	
Examiner	. Art Unit		
Behrooz Senfi	2613		

	Behrooz Senfi	2613					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 12 October 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee have 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as let forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, have reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered b	ecause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NO` w);	TE below);					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be	tter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for				
appeal; and/or	acreamending number of finally rei	aatad alaima					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  1. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amandment	(DTOL 224)				
_	•	impliant Amendment	(FTOL-324).				
<ul> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ul>							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.							
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-5,7,8 and 10-16</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	A bafana an an Aba daka af Elima - Ni	-4:£ A					
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>							
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections under appear	al and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a				
0.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	<u> </u>		•				
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•					
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>			nce because:				
2. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).							
13.  Other:							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant asserts (remarks, page 2, lines 13 - 15) that Shofner "does not disclose a closed circuit through which parameters of a drafting process are controlled and optimized". Examiner respectfully disagrees. Shofner '145 discloses "a closed circuit (figs. 8 - 9), including cameras 130 and 132, illuminition 136 and 138, controller 140 and processor 144" wherein the electronic machine control device uses the information from the electronic image evaluation processor received from the imaging device and sensor to monitor the level of undesirable entities on a continous basis in the gin or mill in order to optimally control them for the purpose of increasing accuracy and/or increasing the amount of information obtained. wherein the whole process is equivalent to optimization for the purpose of increasing the accuracy.

Applicant asserts (remarks, page 3, lines 4 - 7) that "shofner do not control and optimize parameters of a drafting process, for example, "draft delivery speed and friction".

Examiner agrees with applicant. However such features never claimed.

PRIMARY EXAMINER